ATTACHMENT NO. 2 QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN

ATTACHMENT 2 QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN

CONTRACT NO
INTRODUCTION
This Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) has been developed pursuant to the requirements of Section C. the Performance Based Statement of Work in Contract No.
A. PURPOSE OF THE PLAN
1. The QASP is intended to accomplish the following:
a. Define the roles and responsibilities of participating Government officials;

- b. Define the type of work that will be performed;
- c. Describe the evaluation methods employed by the Government in assessing the Contractor's performance;
- d. Describe the process of performance documentation;
- e. Actions that are necessary relating to deficiencies in the Contractor's performance.
- 2. The Contractor will develop a Quality Control (QC) Program (refer to 3.3.7 in the Performance Based Statement of Work) which sets forth procedures and responsibilities for controlling high quality work. Additionally the Contractor will designate a Quality Assurance (QA) employee to be responsible for implementing the QC Program and monitoring the quality of the Contractor's work.

B. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

The following Government officials will participate in assessing the quality of the Contractor's performance. Their roles and responsibilities are described as follows:

- 1. Mr. Edward West will serve as the Contracting Officer (CO) and have overall responsibility for overseeing the Contractor's performance. The CO will also be responsible for the day-to-day monitoring of the Contractor's performance in the areas of contract administration, and property control; reviewing the COR's assessment of the Contractor's performance; and resolving all differences between the COR's assessment and the Contractor's assessment.
- 2. Mr. Paul McAleese will serve as the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) who is designated by the CO to act as an authorized representative in the administration of the contract. The COR will have the responsibility for monitoring, assessing, recording, and reporting on the QA activities of the Contractor to the CO.
- 3. Mr. Gary Taylor will server as a Monitor who is responsible for the day-to-day monitoring of the Contractor's performance including assessing, recording, and reporting on the QA activities of the Contractor to the COR.

C. TYPES OF WORK TO BE PERFORMED

The Contractor shall furnish on a twenty-four hours per day, 365 days per year basis, the day-to-day contract management, planning, supervision, administration, and personnel for the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) of the Yuma Desalting Plant (YDP), the Water Quality Improvement Center (WQIC), and the A-22 Sludge Disposal Site.

D. METHODS OF SURVEILLANCE

The Government will use combinations of 100% surveillance, periodic surveillance, and customer complaints to evaluate the Contractor's performance (refer to the Performance Requirements Summary, Attachment One of the Performance Based Statement of Work).

The Monitor will conduct the following to ensure the Contractor is performing proper O&M and is maintaining the facilities covered by the contract:

- 1. Attend the weekly Government/Contractor Coordination meeting.
- 2. Conduct QA inspections of the YDP, the WQIC, and the A-22 Sludge Disposal Site.
- 3. Coordinate periodically with the Contractor's QA employee.
- 4. Submit and track all MAXIMO work orders requested by the Contractor. This work is accomplished by the Government's Facilities Maintenance Division.
- 5. Review the Contractor's use of the computerized maintenance management system (Mainsaver).

E. QUALITY ASSURANCE INSPECTIONS

- 1. The COR will report any deficiencies found in a twice monthly inspection report to the Contractor and to the CO. If upon receipt of a report the Contractor disagrees with any findings of deficiencies, the Contractor should submit in writing within 7 days to the CO the justifications and reasons why the Contractor feels that the deficiencies are not valid. After reviewing the Contractor's justifications and reasons, the CO will make a final determination within 7 days as to the validity of the deficiencies.
- 2. If the Contractor agrees with the findings of deficiencies in an inspection report, or once a determination on disputed deficiencies is made by the CO, the Contractor shall provide a written response to the COR within 7 days which shall include a plan of action on how and when the reworkable deficiencies will be corrected.
- 3. The COR, after consultation with the CO, will contact the Contractor and if necessary negotiate a corrective plan that is acceptable to the Government.
- 4. The Monitor will appraise the COR on the Contractor's progress on correcting the deficiencies. If the Contractor fails to correct the deficiencies as spelled out in the negotiated corrective plan, the CO will notify the Contractor in writing that the Contractor is in noncompliance with the provisions of the contract.

F. ANALYSIS OF SURVEILLANCE RESULTS

- 1. At the end of each month the COR will prepare a written report for the CO summarizing the overall results of the surveillance of the Contractor's performance of the previous month. This report will become part of the formal QA documentation.
- 2. Deficiencies noted in the formal monthly summary of QA documentation that cannot or have not been reworked within the agreed to corrective plan will result in a deduction of the monthly payment for that required service.
- 3. For services surveyed by periodic inspection, customer complaint, or 100% inspection, the calculation methods to determine payment for Required Services 1 through 6 (refer to Attachment One) are illustrated in the following examples:

<u>EXAMPLE 1</u> - ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE FOR REQUIRED SERVICE -1 (Membrane Element Storage for 8.5-inch and 12-inch elements), (Example for RS-2 would be similar):

Assume the monthly price of the Contract is \$100,000 and the maximum percent of the total monthly price 2%. The maximum error rate (MER) is one occurrence of damage in a year. Assume that there was one occurrence of damage accumulated up to the month being inspected (one error does not exceed the MER of one error). Then:

Maximum payment for acceptable service is .02 X \$100,000 = \$2,000

No incidents occurred in excess of the MER

Payment to the Contractor for this required service = \$2,000

<u>EXAMPLE 2</u> - UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE FOR REQUIRED SERVICE -1 (Membrane Element Storage for 8.5-inch and 12-inch elements), (Example for RS-2 would be similar):

Assume the monthly price of the Contract is \$100,000 and the maximum percent of the total monthly price 2%. The maximum error rate (MER) is one occurrence of damage in a year. Assume that there was two occurrences of damage accumulated up to the month being inspected (two errors exceeds the MER of one error by one error). The percent deduction for unacceptable performance is 50%. Then:

Maximum payment for acceptable service is .02 X \$100,000 =	\$2,000
One incident occurred in excess of the MER is $1 \times .50 \times $2,000 =$	\$1,000
Payment to the Contractor for this required service =	\$1,000

In any subsequent month, during the remainder of the year, that additional membrane elements are damaged the deduction for that month will be: (Number of damaged elements for that month X .50 X Maximum payment for acceptable service).

<u>EXAMPLE 3</u> - ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE FOR REQUIRED SERVICE -3 (Breakdown or Failure Maintenance), (Example for RS-6 would be similar):

Assume the monthly price of the Contract is \$100,000 and the maximum percent of the total monthly price 10%. The maximum error rate (MER) is one occurrence per month. Assume that there was one occurrence of damage during the month being inspected (one error does not exceed the MER of one error). Then:

Maximum payment for acceptable service is .10 X \$100,000 =	\$10,000
No incidents occurred in excess of the MER	
Payment to the Contractor for this required service =	\$10,000

EXAMPLE 4 - UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE FOR REQUIRED SERVICE -3

(Breakdown or Failure Maintenance), (Example for RS-6 would be similar):

Assume the monthly price of the Contract is \$100,000 and the maximum percent of the total monthly price 10%. The maximum error rate (MER) is one occurrence per month. Assume that there was three occurrences during the month being inspected (three errors exceeds the MER of one error by two errors). The percent deduction for unacceptable performance is 15%. Then:

Maximum payment for acceptable service is .10 X \$100,000 =	\$10,000
Two incidents occurred in excess of the MER is $2 \times .15 \times $10,000 =$	\$3,000
Payment to the Contractor for this required service =	\$7,000

<u>EXAMPLE 5</u> - ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE FOR REQUIRED SERVICE -5 (Technical Information), (Example for RS-4 would be similar):

Assume the monthly price of the Contract is \$100,000 and the maximum percent of the total monthly price 10%. The maximum error rate (MER) is no occurrence per month. Assume that there were no late reports during the month being inspected (meets the MER of no errors). Then:

Maximum payment for acceptable service is .10 X \$100,000 =	\$10,000
No incidents occurred in excess of the MER	
Payment to the Contractor for this required service =	\$10,000

<u>EXAMPLE 6</u> - UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE FOR REQUIRED SERVICE -5 (Technical Information), (Example for RS-4 would be similar):

Assume the monthly price of the Contract is \$100,000 and the maximum percent of the total monthly price 10%. The maximum error rate (MER) is no occurrences per month. Assume that there was two occurrences of late reports during the month being inspected (two errors exceeds the MER of no errors by two errors). The percent deduction for unacceptable performance is 10%. Then:

Maximum payment for acceptable service is .10 X \$100,000 =	\$10,000
Two incidents occurred in excess of the MER is $2 \times 10 \times 10,000 =$	\$2,000
Payment to the Contractor for this required service =	\$8,000